

2

Add the following new claim:

28. An alloy film in accordance with Claim 1 wherein said film has a thickness of not more than 2 microns.

REMARKS

Applicants have refiled the instant application as a RCE application and, concurrently with that refiling, amend the broadest claim of the application, Claim 1, to overcome grounds of rejection imposed in the Official Action, denoted as Paper No. 10, directed to the parent of the instant RCE application.

It is emphasized that the amendment to Claim 1 adds no new matter therein. The recitation that the cobalt-iron film is electroplated is supported by the originally filed specification at Page 14, line 31 to Page 15, line 1. That the cobalt-iron alloy electroplated film is a binary alloy is established by the claimed constituency of the alloy film, cobalt and iron exclusively.

In addition, new dependent Claim 28 is also fully supported by the originally filed application. Attention is directed to the specification, at Page 11, lines 3-5, wherein it is recited that the film alloy of the present application has a thickness of up to 2 microns.

Amended Claim 1 and new Claim 28 are patentable over the rejection of Claim 1 in Paper No. 10. That is, amended Claim 1 and new Claim 28 are patentable, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as obvious over U.S. Patent 4,933,026 to Rawlings et al.

As amended, Claim 1 requires that the cobalt-iron binary alloy comprise 25% to about 45% by weight cobalt, based on the total weight of the film. Support for this amendment to Claim 1 is provided in the specification of the originally filed application at Page 13, line 3,

wherein it is recited that the cobalt constituent is present in a concentration of between about 25% and about 45% by weight, based on the total weight of the alloy film.

The teaching of the applied Rawlings et al. reference is directed to cobalt-iron films which include at least a third metal. Indeed, Rawlings et al. indicates binary cobalt-alloys are extremely brittle and that the addition of either vanadium, tantalum, niobium or tantalum and niobium overcome this disadvantage.

The claims of the present application, limited as they are to a binary alloy consisting of cobalt and iron, is thus novel over the teaching of Rawlings et al. In addition, the unobviousness of amended Claim 1 is established by the teaching away from the claimed invention by Rawlings et al.

Dependent Claim 28 is clearly distinguished from Rawlings et al. insofar as it is limited to a film having a thickness no greater than 2 microns. The teaching of Rawlings et al. produces a film having a minimum thickness of 0.35 mm (Column 1, lines 51-59). As those skilled in the art are aware, 0.35 mm is equal to 350 microns. Clearly, such a distinction not only establishes the novelty of the film of Claim 28 but, in addition, emphasizes its unobviousness over Rawlings et al. insofar as a film no thicker than 2 microns can be used in applications that could never employ the very relative thick film disclosed in Rawlings et al.

This is especially the case insofar as the principal use of the film of the present application is as a head of a magnetic recording system. Those skilled in the art are aware that thicknesses in the order of 0.35 mm can never be utilized in such applications.

The above amendment and remarks overcome the rejection imposed in the final rejection of the parent application of which the present RCE application is a continuation.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

## APPENDIX

### RENDITION OF APPLICATION AMENDMENT SHOWING CHANGES MADE

Claim 1 (Amended): A cobalt-iron binary alloy electroplated film [comprising an cobalt-iron alloy film] having a saturation magnetization of at least about 2.30 Telsa, said film consisting of a binary alloy, (100%-x)Co(x)Fe, where x is between about 55% and about 75% [iron and the remainder cobalt, said percentage being] by weight [based on the total weight of the alloy].

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**